REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the instant application. In the most recent Office Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,384,892 to Strong (hereinafter, "Strong") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,714,948 to Farmakis, et al. (hereinafter, "Farmakis"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,208,750 to Kurami, et al. (hereinafter, "Kurami"). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Farmakis, further in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/169613-A1 by Damiba (hereinafter, "Damiba"). Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Farmakis, further in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/133347-A1 by Schoneburg (hereinafter, "Schoneburg"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Farmakis, further in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,866 to Cope, et al. (hereinafter, "Cope"). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/161584-A1 by Lewis, et al. (hereinafter, "Lewis"). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Schoneburg. Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,869 to Chapados, et al. (hereinafter, "Chapados"). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami, further in view of Chapados, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,670 to Stammler, et al. (hereinafter, "Stammler"). Claim 11 and 12 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,725,956 to Jenkins (hereinafter, "Jenkins"). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,402 to Monaco, et al. (hereinafter, "Monaco"). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Strong in view of Kurami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,592 to Neumann, et al. (hereinafter, "Neumann"). Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a dialog processing system for an uninhabited air vehicle (UAV) comprising, *inter alia*, a control system that records a state of the UAV, and an interpretation unit dynamically linked to the control system, so that the interpretation unit utilizes UAV state data to interpret input data. The Office Action alleges that Strong teaches a control system that records the state of the UAV, and an interpretation unit dynamically linked to the control system utilizing UAV state data to interpret input data (Office Action, p. 3). Independent claim 7 recites a method of dialog processing for an uninhabited air vehicle comprising, *inter alia*, interpreting detected commands in context of dynamic UAV state information. The Office Action alleges that Strong teaches this step (Office Action, p. 8). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Strong relates to a dynamic language model for speech recognition. There is no teaching or suggestion in Strong that the speech recognition relates to a UAV in any way. Looking to Farmakis, the reference discloses only a system for tracking and controlling conventional human-piloted aircraft, not uninhabited air vehicles. Moreover, the Office Action itself acknowledges, in contradiction with its earlier assertions as to

Strong, but as it must, that neither Strong nor Farmakis discloses that the state information as recited in the claim is a UAV state (Office Action, p. 4).

The Office Action offers Kurami as teaching control of an uninhabited air vehicle. Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to its title, Kurami relates to a control system for an unmanned automotive vehicle. There is no teaching or suggestion in Kurami regarding the control of uninhabited air vehicles.

It has been held by the courts that in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As shown above, neither Strong, Farmakis, nor Kurami, taken singly or in any combination, teach or suggest the recited system or method for dialog processing in an uninhabited air vehicle. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 are patentably distinguished over the references.

Claims 2-6 and 8-16 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 7, respectively. The rejection of each dependent claim relies upon the same combination of references applied to underlying independent claims 1 and 7, which has been obviated above. While these dependent claims are each separately patentable, they are offered as patentable for at least the same reasons as their underlying independent base claims.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all independent claims recites patentable subject matter, and kindly solicits an early and favorable indication of allowability of all claims. If the Examiner has any reservation in

allowing the claims, and believes that a telephone interview would advance prosecution, she is kindly requested to telephone the undersigned at her earliest convenience

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Torrente
Registration No. 49,099

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza-Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

DJT:rd